

Message

From: Sivak, Michael [Sivak.Michael@epa.gov]
Sent: 5/30/2018 1:12:11 PM
To: Donovan, Betsy [Donovan.Betsy@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: rolling knolls question

Thanks! I'm working on the memo/addendum to the HHRA. I hope to have something for the team to review later this week. It's not difficult, I just keep getting distracted (other sites, something shiny in the distance...you know...)

Michael Sivak
212.637.4310

From: Donovan, Betsy
Sent: Wednesday, May 30, 2018 9:10 AM
To: Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: rolling knolls question

Michael, Thanks. I don't think you need to dive any deeper into this. I let ORC know the rationale for HHRA trespasser evaluation and that we don't have any evidence that FWS reviewed or commented on the HHRA. It appears the Group mistakenly stated that FWS reviewed the HHRA. If they need more info. I will let you know.

From: Sivak, Michael
Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2018 6:40 PM
To: Donovan, Betsy <Donovan.Betsy@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: rolling knolls question

Betsy,

Sorry it's taken me so long to reply to this – I was on travel and am just now able to go through the BHHRA that EPA developed.

That report did evaluate risk to adolescent and adult trespassers throughout the landfill, which includes the part of the landfill on the Great Swamp Wildlife Refuge. We evaluated exposure to these populations at a rate of 143 days/year, which was reduced to 84 days/year with the development of the ARS (and will be memorialized in the memo I need to write that will be added to the admin record. ☺). So, we didn't call the population "hikers" or "recreators", but we did evaluate exposure to adults and adolescents with access to the area; we just used the term "trespassers".

As I think I said in my email to you last week, I'm not sure if FWS reviewed the BHHRA. But I would be surprised if they had a concern with an exposure frequency of either 143 days/year or even 84 days/year for hikers.

I hope this helps. I'll keep going through the chain of emails to see if there's anything else I can add.

Michael Sivak
212.637.4310

From: Donovan, Betsy
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2018 4:49 PM
To: Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: rolling knolls question

Hi Michael, ORC is reviewing the PRPs responses to FWS comments on the FS – attached. Please see Sarah’s message below regarding the HHRA... Did DOI/FWS review the HHRA? Did DOI/FWS object to our decision not to include passive recreationalist in the HHRA? Thanks and I will ask Tanya if you don’t recall....

From: Fajardo, Juan
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2018 4:40 PM
To: Flanagan, Sarah <Flanagan.Sarah@epa.gov>; Donovan, Betsy <Donovan.Betsy@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: rolling knolls question

Betsy, what do you say?

From: Flanagan, Sarah
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2018 4:37 PM
To: Fajardo, Juan <Fajardo.Juan@epa.gov>
Subject: rolling knolls question

Ex. 5 Attorney Work Product (AWP)